FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

RIVERINE STRUCTURES FORM

O.M.B. No. 3067-0148 Expires September 30, 2005

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 7 hours per response. The burden estimate includes the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the needed data, and completing, reviewing, and submitting the form. You are not required to respond to this collection of information unless a valid OMB control number appears in the upper right corner of this form. Send comments regarding the accuracy of the burden estimate and any suggestions for reducing this burden to: Information Collections Management, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street, SW, Washington DC 20472, Paperwork Reduction Project (3067-0148). Submission of the form is required to obtain or retain benefits under the National Flood Insurance Program. **Please do not send your completed survey to the above address.**

Flooding Source:
Note: Fill out one form for each flooding source studied

A GENERAL

Comp	Complete the appropriate section(s) for each Structure listed below:						
	Channelization	complete Section Ccomplete Section D	3)				
Desc	Description Of Structure						
1.	Name of Structure:						
	Type (check one):	☐ Channelization	☐ Bridge/Culvert	☐ Levee/Floodwall	☐ Dam		
	Location of Structure:						
	Downstream Limit/Cros	ss Section:					
	Upstream Limit/Cross S	Section:					
2.	Name of Structure:						
	Type (check one):	☐ Channelization	☐ Bridge/Culvert	☐ Levee/Floodwall	☐ Dam		
	Location of Structure:						
	Downstream Limit/Cros	ss Section:					
	Upstream Limit/Cross S	Section:					
3.	Name of Structure:						
	Type (check one)	☐ Channelization	☐ Bridge/Culvert	Levee/Floodwall	☐ Dam		
	Location of Structure:						
	Downstream Limit/Cros	ss Section:					
	Upstream Limit/Cross S	Section:					
NOT	E: For more structur	es, attach additional pages	as needed.				

B. CHANNELIZATION

Floo	oding Source:					
Nan	Name of Structure:					
1.	Accessory Structures					
	The channelization includes (check one):					
	□ Levees [Attach Section E (Levee/Floodwall)] □ Drop structures □ Superelevated sections □ Transitions in cross sectional geometry □ Debris basin/detention basin □ Energy dissipator □ Other (Describe):					
2.	Drawing Checklist					
	Attach the plans of the channelization certified by a registered professional engineer, as described in the instructions.					
3.	Hydraulic Considerations					
	The channel was designed to carry (cfs) and/or the -year flood.					
	The design elevation in the channel is based on (check one):					
	☐ Subcritical flow ☐ Critical flow ☐ Supercritical flow ☐ Energy grade line					
	If there is the potential for a hydraulic jump at the following locations, check all that apply and attach an explanation of how the hydraulic jump is controlled without affecting the stability of the channel.					
	☐ Inlet to channel ☐ Outlet of channel ☐ At Drop Structures ☐ At Transitions ☐ Other locations (specify):					
4.	Sediment Transport Considerations					
	Was sediment transport considered?					
	in No, their attach your explanation for why Seulment transport was not considered.					
	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT					
- Flori	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT					
	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT					
Nan	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT adding Source: ne of Structure:					
	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT adding Source: the of Structure: This revision reflects (check one):					
Nan	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT adding Source: ne of Structure:					
Nan	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT Inding Source: In e of Structure: This revision reflects (check one): New bridge/culvert not modeled in the FIS Modified bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS					
Nan 1. 2.	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT doing Source: ne of Structure: This revision reflects (check one): Mew bridge/culvert not modeled in the FIS Modified bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS New analysis of bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS Hydraulic model used to analyze the structure (e.g., HEC-2 with special bridge routine, WSPRO, HY8): If different than hydraulic analysis for the flooding source, justify why the hydraulic analysis used for the flooding source could not analyze the					
Nan 1. 2.	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT Diding Source: The of Structure: This revision reflects (check one): Mew bridge/culvert not modeled in the FIS Modified bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS New analysis of bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS Hydraulic model used to analyze the structure (e.g., HEC-2 with special bridge routine, WSPRO, HY8): If different than hydraulic analysis for the flooding source, justify why the hydraulic analysis used for the flooding source could not analyze the structures. Attach justification. Attach plans of the structures certified by a registered professional engineer. The plan detail and information should include the following					
Nan 1. 2.	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT coding Source: ne of Structure: This revision reflects (check one): New bridge/culvert not modeled in the FIS New analysis of bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS New analysis of bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS Hydraulic model used to analyze the structure (e.g., HEC-2 with special bridge routine, WSPRO, HY8): If different than hydraulic analysis for the flooding source, justify why the hydraulic analysis used for the flooding source could not analyze the structures. Attach justification. Attach plans of the structures certified by a registered professional engineer. The plan detail and information should include the following (check the information that has been provided): Dimensions (height, width, span, radius, length) Shape (culverts only) Material Beveling or Rounding Wing Wall Angle Stream Invert Elevations – Upstream and Downstream Structure Invert Elevations – Upstream and Downstream Cross-Section Locations					

D. DAM

Floodi	ing Source:
Name	e of Structure:
1. T	This request is for (check one): Existing dam New dam Modification of existing dam
2. T	The dam was designed by (check one): Federal agency State agency Local government agency
	Private organization Name of the agency or organization:
3. D	Does the project involve revised hydrology? Yes No
	If Yes, complete the Riverine Hydrology & Hydraulics Form (Form 2).
4. D	Does the submittal include debris/sediment yield analysis? Yes No
	f yes, then fill out Section F (Sediment Transport). f No, then attach your explanation for why debris/sediment analysis was not considered.
5. D	Does the Base Flood Elevation behind the dam or downstream of the dam change?
	Yes No If Yes, complete the Riverine Hydrology & Hydraulics Form (Form 2) and complete the table below.
	Stillwater Elevation Behind the Dam
	FREQUENCY (% annual chance) FIS REVISED
	10-year (10%) 50-year (2%) 100-year (1%) 500-year (0.2%) Normal Pool Elevation
6. P	Please attach a copy of the formal Operation and Maintenance Plan

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL

1.	Sys	stem Elements					
	a.	a. This Levee/Floodwall analysis is based on (check one):					
		□ upgrading of an existing levee/floodwall system □ a newly constructed levee/floodwall system □ reanalysis of an existing levee/floodwall system					
	b.	Levee elements and locations are (check one):					
		structural floodwall	tation tation tation	to to to			
	c.	Structural Type (check one):					
		 monolithic cast-in place reinforced concrete reinforced concrete masonry block sheet piling Other (describe): 					
	d.	Has this levee/floodwall system been certified by a Federal agency	to provide (protection from the base flood?	?		
		☐ Yes ☐ No					
		If Yes, by which agency?					
	e.	Attach certified drawings containing the following information (indica	ate drawing	sheet numbers):			
		1. Plan of the levee embankment and floodwall structures.	Sheet N	umbers:			
		 A profile of the levee/floodwall system showing the Base Flood Elevation (BFE), levee and/or wall crest and foundation, and closure locations for the total levee system. 	Sheet N	umbers:			
		A profile of the BFE, closure opening outlet and inlet invert elevations, type and size of opening, and kind of closure.	Sheet N	umbers:			
		4. A layout detail for the embankment protection measures.	Sheet N	umbers:			
		 Location, layout, and size and shape of the levee embankment features, foundation treatment, floodwall structure, closure structures, and pump stations. 	Sheet N	umbers:			
2.	Fre	eeboard					
	a.	The minimum freeboard provided above the BFE is:					
		Riverine					
		3.0 feet or more at the downstream end and throughout3.5 feet or more at the upstream end4.0 feet within 100 feet upstream of all structures and/or constriction	ons		☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No	
		Coastal					
		1.0 foot above the height of the one percent wave associated with stillwater surge elevation or maximum wave runup (whichever is gr		ual-chance	☐ Yes	□ No	
		2.0 feet above the 1%-annual-chance stillwater surge elevation			☐ Yes	□ No	
		• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			_	_	

2.	Freeboard (continued)								
	Please note, occasionally exceptions are made to the minimum freeboard requirement. If an exception is requested, attach documentation addressing Paragraph 65.10(b)(1)(ii) of the NFIP Regulations.								
	If No is answered to any of the above, please attach an explanation.								
	b. Is there an indication from historical records that ice-jamming can affect the BFE? ☐ Yes ☐ No								
	If Yes, provide ice						above still exis	sts.	
3.	Closures								
	a. Openings through	the levee system	(check one):	□ ex	xists 🗌 do	es not exist			
	If opening exists, I	ist all closures:							
Cha	nnel Station	Left or Righ	at Bank	Opening	Type	Highest	Elevation for	Type of (Closure Device
One		Lon or raigi	it Barik	Operang	Турс		ing Invert	Турс от с	Diosure Device
(Ext	end table on an adde	l d sheet as need	ed and refer	rence)					
•									
NOL	e: Geotechnical and	-			:	field end le	h a wata w . i.a		م طائد منا المحمد ال
	In addition to the red design analysis for Corps of Engineers	the following sy	stem feature	es should be su					
4.	Embankment Prot	ection							
	a. The maximum le	evee slope lands	ide is:						
	b. The maximum le	evee slope floods	side is:						
	c. The range of vel	ocities along the	e levee durin	g the base floo	od is:	(min.) to	(max.)		
	d. Embankment ma	aterial is protecte	ed by (descr	ibe what kind):					
	e. Riprap Design Parameters (check one):								
			<u></u>		0		Stone Rip	ran	D 11 (
	Reach	Sideslope	Flow Depth	Velocity	Curve or Straight		D ₅₀	Thickness	Depth of Toedown
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
(Ext	end table on an adde	d sheet as need	ed and refer	ence each ent	ry)				

4.	<u>Emb</u>	ankment Protection (continued)			
	f. I	Is a bedding/filter analysis and design attached? Yes No			
	g. [Describe the analysis used for other kinds of pro	otection used (include copies of the design analysis):		
		Attach engineering analysis to support construc	ction plans.		
5.		ankment And Foundation Stability	·		
	a.	Identify locations and describe the basis for sele	ection of critical location for analysis:		
	[Overall height: Sta. ; height ft.			
	[Limiting foundation soil strength:			
		Sta. , depth to			
		strength φ = degrees, c = psf			
		slope: $SS = (h)$ to (v)			
		(Repeat as needed on an added sheet for a	udditional locations)		
	b.		nodology used (e.g., circular arc, sliding block, infinite slop	ne etc):	
	D.	opeony the embankment stability analysis meth	locology used (e.g., circular are, sharing block, illimite stop	50, 010.).	
	C.	Summary of stability analysis results:			
	O.	Carminary or classify analysis results.			
С					
	ase	Loading Conditions	Critical Safety Factor	Criteria (Min.)	
	ase	Loading Conditions End of construction	Critical Safety Factor	Criteria (Min.) 1.3	
		-	Critical Safety Factor	i i	
	I	End of construction	Critical Safety Factor	1.3	
	I II	End of construction Sudden drawdown	Critical Safety Factor	1.3	
	I II III	End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage	Critical Safety Factor	1.3 1.0 1.4	
	I II III IV VI	End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage	Critical Safety Factor	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4	
	IIIIIVVI	End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I)		1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4	
	I II III IV VI erence	End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) E: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1)		1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4	
	I II III IV VI erence d. \	End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) E. USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment per	erformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4	
	I II III IV VI erence d. \	End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) E: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment performs of Yes, describe methodology used:	erformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4	
	I II III IV VI erence d. \ I e. \ f. \	End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) E: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment performance of Yes, describe methodology used: Was a seepage analysis for the foundation performance of the seepage analysis for the seepage analysis	erformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4	
	I II III IV VI erence d. \ I e. \ f. \ g. \	End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) E: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment performance of Yes, describe methodology used: Was a seepage analysis for the foundation performance uplift pressures at the embankment landsingles.	erformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4	
	I II III IV VI erence d. \ \	End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) E: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment performance of Yes, describe methodology used: Was a seepage analysis for the foundation performance uplift pressures at the embankment landsing were seepage exit gradients checked for piping	erformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4	
	I II III IV VI erence d. \ \	End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) E: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment performance of Yes, describe methodology used: Was a seepage analysis for the foundation performance of Yes and Yes analysis for the foundation performance of Yes and Yes analysis for the foundation performance of Yes and Yes analysis for the foundation performance of Yes analysis for the foundation per	erformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4	

				EEN EGGEWAEE (
6. <u>F</u> l	loodwall And Found	lation Stability					
a. Describe analysis submittal based on Code (check			k one):				
	☐ UBC (1988)	or 🗌	Other (specify):				
b.	. Stability analysis	submitted provid	des for:				
	☐ Overturning	☐ Sliding	If not, explain	1:			
C.	. Loading included	I in the analyses	were:				
	☐ Lateral earth	@ P _A = p	sf; P _p =	psf			
	☐ Surcharge-Sl	lope @ ,	surface	psf			
	☐ Wind @ P _w =	= psf					
	☐ Seepage (Up	olift);	☐ Earth	quake @ P _{eq} =	%g		
	☐ 1%-annual-c	hance significant	t wave height:	ft.			
	☐ 1%-annual-ch	nance significant	wave period:	sec.			
d.	. Summary of Sta	ability Analysis Re	esults: Factors of	of Safety.			
	Itemize for each	range in site lay	out dimension a	nd loading condition li	mitation for each respe	ective reach.	
Loa	ding Condition	Criteria	a (Min)	Sta	То	Sta	То
Loa	ding Condition	Criteria Overturn	a (Min) Sliding	Sta Overturn	To Sliding	Sta Overturn	To Sliding
Loa Dead &							
	Wind	Overturn	Sliding				
Dead &	Wind	Overturn 1.5	Sliding 1.5				
Dead & Dead & Dead, S Impact	Wind Soil	Overturn 1.5 1.5	Sliding 1.5 1.5				
Dead & Dead & Dead, S Impact	Wind Soil Soil, Flood, & Soil, & Seismic	Overturn 1.5 1.5 1.5	Sliding 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5	Overturn			
Dead & Dead & Dead, S Impact	Wind Soil Soil, Flood, & Soil, & Seismic (Ref: F	Overturn 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 FEMA 114 Sept 2	Sliding 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3	Overturn	Sliding		
Dead & Dead & Dead, S Impact	Wind Soil Soil, Flood, & Soil, & Seismic (Ref: F	Overturn 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 FEMA 114 Sept 2	Sliding 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 1986; USACE EN	Overturn M 1110-2-2502)	Sliding		
Dead & Dead & Dead, S Impact Dead, S	Wind Soil Soil, Flood, & Soil, & Seismic (Ref: F (Note:	Overturn 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 FEMA 114 Sept ** Extend table on	Sliding 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 1986; USACE EN	Overturn M 1110-2-2502)	Sliding nce)	Overturn	
Dead & Dead & Dead, S Impact Dead, S	Wind Soil Soil, Flood, & Soil, & Seismic (Ref: F (Note:	Overturn 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 FEMA 114 Sept ** Extend table on ring strength for each of the st	Sliding 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 1986; USACE EN	Overturn M 1110-2-2502) as needed and refere	Sliding nce)	Overturn	Sliding
Dead & Dead & Dead, S Impact Dead, S e.	Soil, Flood, & Soil, Seismic (Ref: F (Note: Foundation bear	Overturn 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 FEMA 114 Sept ** Extend table on ring strength for each of the st	Sliding 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 1986; USACE EN	Overturn M 1110-2-2502) as needed and refere	Sliding nce)	Overturn	Sliding
Dead & Dead & Dead, S Impact Dead, S e.	Soil, Flood, & Soil, Seismic (Ref: F (Note: . Foundation bear Bearin ted design maximur	Overturn 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 FEMA 114 Sept 2 Extend table on ring strength for early gressure g Pressure	Sliding 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 1986; USACE EN an added sheet each soil type:	Overturn M 1110-2-2502) as needed and refere Sustained	Sliding nce)	Overturn Short Ter	Sliding

7.	<u>Se</u>	<u>ttlement</u>
	a.	Has anticipated potential settlement been determined and incorporated into the specified construction elevations to maintain the established freeboard margin?
	b.	The computed range of settlement is ft. to ft.
	c.	Settlement of the levee crest is determined to be primarily from :
		☐ Foundation consolidation ☐ Embankment compression ☐ Other (Describe):
	d.	Differential settlement of floodwalls 🔲 has 🗎 has not been accommodated in the structural design and construction.
		Attach engineering analysis to support construction plans.
8.	Inte	erior Drainage
	a.	Specify size of each interior watershed:
		Draining to pressure conduit: acres Draining to ponding area: acres
	b.	Relationships Established
		Ponding elevation vs. storage
	c.	The river flow duration curve is enclosed:
	d.	Specify the discharge capacity of the head pressure conduit: cfs
	e.	Which flooding conditions were analyzed?
		 Gravity flow (Interior Watershed) Common storm (River Watershed) Historical ponding probability Coastal wave overtopping
		If No for any of the above, attach explanation.
	f.	Interior drainage has been analyzed based on joint probability of interior and exterior flooding and the capacities of pumping and outlet facilities to provide the established level of flood protection. \square Yes \square No
		If No, attach explanation.
	g.	The rate of seepage through the levee system for the base flood is cfs
	h.	The length of levee system used to drive this seepage rate in item g: ft.

: #2
#2
#2
ı
nding elevations for all
ļ
!
de of the structure?
1
ЭĖ

		1 /
10.	<u>Ope</u>	erational Plan And Criteria
	a.	Are the planned/installed works in full compliance with Part 65.10 of the NFIP Regulations?
	b.	Does the operation plan incorporate all the provisions for closure devices as required in Paragraph 65.10(c)(1) of the NFIP regulations? Yes
	c.	Does the operation plan incorporate all the provisions for interior drainage as required in Paragraph 65.10(c)(2) of the NFIP regulations? \[\sum \text{Yes} \text{No} \]
		If the answer is No to any of the above, please attach supporting documentation.
11.	<u>Mai</u>	ntenance Plan
	a.	Are the planned/installed works in full compliance with Part 65.10 of the NFIP Regulations?
12.	<u>Ope</u>	erations and Maintenance Plan
		Please attach a copy of the formal Operations and Maintenance Plan for the levee/floodwall.
		F. SEDIMENT TRANSPORT
Flood	ling (Source:
Nam	e of S	Structure:
Base a pot	Floo entia	any indication from historical records that sediment transport (including scour and deposition) can affect the od Elevation (BFE); and/or based on the stream morphology, vegetative cover, development of the watershed and bank conditions, there is I for debris and sediment transport (including scour and deposition) to affect the BFEs, then provide the following information along with orting documentation:
Sedir	nent	load associated with the base flood discharge: Volume acre-feet
Debri	s loa	nd associated with the base flood discharge: Volume acre-feet
Sedir	nent	transport rate (percent concentration by volume)
Meth	od u	sed to estimate sediment transport:
		ment transport formulas are intended for a range of hydraulic conditions and sediment sizes; attach a detailed explanation for using the nethod.
Meth	od u	sed to estimate scour and/or deposition:
Pleas	se no	sed to revise hydraulic or hydrologic analysis (model) to account for sediment transport: te that bulked flows are used to evaluate the performance of a structure during the base flood; however, FEMA does not map BFEs based flows.
		ent analysis has not been performed, an explanation as to why sediment transport (including scour and deposition) will not affect the BFEs res must be provided.